



**Arguments in response to first office action dated: 5/6/2008**

Claims 1-18, were rejected under 35 USC 112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 USC 112. Applicant states that in his amended claims, any references to indefinite and functional or operational language have been removed and the structure, which goes to make up the device, is clearly and positively specified. The structure is organized and correlated in such a way that it presents a complete operative device.

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 USC 112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraphs as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as applicant's invention. Applicant states that in his amended claims he distinctly claims the subject matter regarded as his invention, thereby removing any indefinite wording.

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 USC 101 as failing to point out a particular statutory class. Applicant states that his amended claims reflect a single statutory class per grouping of claims.